

The Confessional “Rule” and the Dubrovnik Exception: The Origins of the “Serb-Catholic” Circle in Nineteenth-Century Dalmatia

It is commonly supposed that confessional adherence was the decisive element in the growth of Croat and Serb nationhood: “In the differentiation of Serbs from Croats and the rise of modern Serb and Croat national consciousness, religion played the essential role in the Serbo-Croatian linguistic area. Whereas the Catholics by rule became Croats, the Orthodox were Serbs.”¹ This none too precise formulation assumes that, quite independently of preexisting South Slavic affinities, a homogeneous national “mass” became heterogeneous by reason of outside dispensational intervention. Without fully analyzing whether religion indeed separated the South Slavs into different nationalities or whether religious affiliation simply reflected the allogenic nature of the South Slavic settlement — such an analysis would be difficult to sustain on the basis of current ethnogenetic knowledge—I suggest that the confessional “rule” is hardly as firm as some scholars suppose and needs to be qualified.

Specific forms of national consciousness existed among the Serbs and Croats long before the age of nationalism. We are not directly concerned here with the large question of the impulses and progressions in the movement from national consciousness to nationalism. We can, however, approach the question in reverse order by examining the way in which the aggregation of national perceptions can create a new national consciousness. The subject is that of the origins of an intellectual circle in mid-nineteenth-century Dubrovnik (Ragusa), whose principals violated the Serb-Croat confessional “rule.” Though Catholics, they came to espouse a Serb national ideology and political goals. What is remarkable about this case is that it is possible to reconstruct every important detail in the background, motivation, and career of the principals themselves — making it unnecessary to seek the putative material basis for their orientation. That orientation can at best explain the inclination toward Serb national ideology among Ragusan intellectuals, but not its acceptance. What follows is the unraveling of an intellectual construct that came about as the result of modern mutations in national consciousness.²

The author is greatly indebted to the staffs of the Historical Archives (*Historijski arhiv*) in Dubrovnik, the Lexicographical Institution (*Leksikografski zavod*), and the University and National Library (*Sveučilišna i nacionalna knjižnica*) in Zagreb, the Archives of the Historical Institute of the Serbian Academy of Sciences (*Arhiv Istoriskog instituta SAN*) and the Library of the Serbian Patriarchate (*Biblioteka Srpske patrijaršije*) in Belgrade, and of the Dominican Monastery and Scientific Library (*Naučna biblioteka*) in Dubrovnik. Their generous and hospitable assistance is much appreciated.

1. Rade Petrović, *Nacionalno pitanje u Dalmaciji u XIX stoljeću* (Sarajevo, 1968), p. 366.

2. Aside from the works on the 1879 Croat-Serb split in Dalmatia and the polemical literature that this and subsequent incidents provoked, scholarly literature has hardly touched upon the subject of “Serb-Catholics.” The emergence of the group is mentioned in two postwar studies: Vinko Foretić, “Prva faza hrvatskog narodnog preporoda u Dalmaciji (do sredine 19. stoljeća),” *Kolo*

The structure of the old corporative-patrician order of the Republic of Dubrovnik, which was based on the political monopoly of the noble estate, had grown weak by the beginning of the nineteenth century. Napoleon's abolition of Dubrovnik's independence (1808) and the Habsburg rule that followed (1815) greatly reduced the political role of the nobility without at the same time improving the position of the commoners. Relegated to a *Kreis* of Dalmatia, Dubrovnik shared the fate of this neglected and perhaps most wretched province of the entire Habsburg Monarchy. Economic stagnation, along with a growing sense of helplessness, led to the gloomily introspective cult of Dubrovnik's golden past and a bitter abhorrence of everything Austrian. The writer Ivan Stojanović (1829–1900), a Catholic clergyman of commoner background who was one of the leaders of the "Serb-Catholic" circle at the end of the nineteenth century, put it this way: "We who were born during the first decade of Austrian rule . . . can say (we speak of all our contemporaries) that we were born in the most unhappy period of human history. We did not get a chance at the past or taste its sweetness and we do not like the new age."³

The alien and bureaucratic character of Habsburg rule made this past all the more alluring by contrast. Though Ragusans nurtured an intense local patriotism, they were clearly conscious of their Slavic identity in the broadest sense of the term. Moreover, within the wider Dalmatian sphere Ragusans were conscious of their Croat regional affiliation.⁴ This awareness constituted a link with the northern Croat lands, which increasingly looked upon Dubrovnik as the source of Croat letters and as the leader in attempts to forge a single Croat linguistic standard based on the štokavian dialect, the most widespread linguistic medium common to most Croats and almost all Serbs. Starting early in the seventeenth century, and especially between 1750 and 1830, the štokavian dialects of Dubrovnik, central Dalmatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and Slavonia were forged into a common linguistic standard that in turn determined the course taken by the Illyrianist movement of the 1830s.⁵

The eagerness with which the reading public in the kajkavian dialect area of northwestern Croatia sought out the works of Ivan Gundulić, Junije Palmotić, Ignjat Djurdjević, and other classical Dubrovnik poets created a marked "Dubrovnik-štokavian" orientation that favored accepting the Ragusan idiom as the Croat linguistic norm.⁶ Ironically, Habsburg rule so numbed the inhabitants of Dubrovnik and Dalmatia that their Croat national consciousness and native literary expression was aroused only in response to the enthusiasm which

(Zagreb) 4 (1966), nos. 8–10: 167 and n. 23; Stijepo Obad, "Nacionalno pitanje u Dalmaciji 1848–1849. godine," *Jugoslavenski istorijski časopis* (Belgrade), 1969, no. 4: 66.

3. Ivan Stojanović, "Engelova povjest Dubrovačke Republike: Nastavak prevoditelja Ivana kan. Stojanovića," *Dubrovnik* (Dubrovnik), 8 (1899), no. 42: 3.

4. For evidence on the premodern national consciousness in Dubrovnik, see Vjekoslav Klaić, "Crtice o starom Dubrovniku," *Vienac* (Zagreb), 21 (1899), no. 20: 316–18. See also Vinko Foretić, "Dubrovnik u doba Marina Držića," in *Marin Držić: Zbornik radova*, ed. Jakša Ravlić (Zagreb, 1969), pp. 18–27.

5. For the most up-to-date exposition of the problem, see Dalibor Brozović, "Hrvatski jezik, njegovo mjesto unutar južnoslavenskih i drugih slavenskih jezika, njegove povijesne mijene kao jezika hrvatske književnosti," in *Hrvatska književnost u evropskom kontekstu*, ed. Aleksandar Flaker and Krunoslav Pranjić (Zagreb, 1978), pp. 34–66.

6. Franjo Fancev, *Dokumenti za naše podrijetlo hrvatskoga preporeda (1790–1832)* (Zagreb, 1933), pp. xxxii–xxxiii.

their northern countrymen felt for Dubrovnik's bygone cultural glories. Meanwhile, Habsburg officialdom, largely imported from Austrian Lombardy and Venetia, did its best to encourage the use of Italian as the exclusive language of administration and the privileged medium of instruction. Thus for the first time in the history of Dalmatia, the intellectual elite was exposed not only to Italian culture, as it had always been, but also to Italian national consciousness.⁷

The Illyrian phase of the Croat Revival did much to lift the Dalmatians out of their lethargy. Ljudevit Gaj (1809–1872) and his associates believed that Croat (and South Slavic) unity required a supranational South Slavic or Illyrian identity based on a common language. After due consideration, Gaj decided upon štokavian, already in the process of standardization among the majority of Croats outside kajkavian Croatia (and in a different form among the Serbs) and established a modified version of that dialect as the Illyrian linguistic norm to which he hoped to attract all the South Slavs.

Dubrovnik naturally held a special place in the Illyrian program. In Gaj's own words, the dignity of his linguistic choice was enhanced by the "priceless literary treasure of forty and more classical writers from the *Illyrian Parnassus* — *Dubrovnik* . . . and by other important literary accomplishments, which by inherent right we again assumed as our ancient heritage."⁸ Illyrian enthusiasm was reciprocated in kind. With the publication of *Zora dalmatinska* (Dalmatian Dawn) in 1844 in Zadar, national revival in Dalmatia captured the imagination of a sizable group of intellectuals. By 1848 they were confident enough to declare themselves explicitly political by calling for the unification of Dalmatia with Croatia.

Though Illyrianism was a great success from the standpoint of Croat national consolidation, it received scant support outside the Croat national community. Gaj could not abandon Croat literary tradition, which remained an obstacle to full unity with the other South Slavs, nor could he relinquish specific Croat identification, which alone legitimized Croatia's ancient municipal rights in the constitutional contest with Hungary. The Croat overtones in Illyrianism were not, however, its chief drawback among the Serbs and Slovenes. Distinct forms of national consciousness had already gained the upper hand in these communities. And whereas the rejection of national assimilation among the Slavs expressed the early modern tendency in Illyrianism, the national ideologies of the Serbs and Slovenes were often clearly assimilationist and founded on modern theories. Their willingness to increase their own national groups, usually by an ostensibly scientific formula (after the fashion of the times), was in fact an inverted form of exclusiveness. The national ideology of Vuk Stefanović Karadžić (1787–1864) is a case in point.

The recognition of Karadžić's decisive role in the reform of Serbian language has obscured the ideological underpinnings of his celebrated effort. His choice of the štokavian dialect of Hercegovina (spoken also in Dubrovnik) as the Serbian literary language was an affirmation of a totally new definition of Serbian nationhood. Traditionally, only an Eastern Orthodox Christian could be a Serb. Karadžić's modern definition of Serbdom, equating it with the use of štokavian dialect, revised this notion. As long as one spoke štokavian, a

7. Grga Novak, *Prošlost Dalmacije*, 2 (Zagreb, 1944): 322–25.

8. Ljudevit Gaj, "Proglas," *Danica ilirska* (Zagreb), 2 (1836), no. 49: 195.

dialect common to Croats and Serbs, one had to be Serb, whether one professed the Catholic or Muslim faith.

Karadžić's national equation followed the erroneous teachings of the first specialists in Slavic linguistics. The error originated with Ludwig von Schlötzer (1735–1809), a German historian who considered štokavian a Serb dialect, and was continued by Czech, Slovak, and Slovene pioneers in Slavic studies (Josef Dobrovský, Jernej Kopitar, Jan Kollár, Pavel Josef Šafařík, Franc Miklošič). In addition, the philologists usually expropriated Croat kajkavian dialect for the Slovenes or considered it Croat only by virtue of popular belief. As a result, since čakavian alone was recognized as a genuine Croat dialect by the early Slavicists, Croat national territory was reduced to the area of the čakavian dialect, that is, to Istria, the northeastern Adriatic littoral, and the offshore islands.

The unique Croat dialectal situation, that is, the use of three distinct dialects (štokavian, kajkavian, and čakavian — in that order and with štokavian preponderance in the creation of the Croatian koine), could not be reconciled with the romantic belief that language was the most profound expression of national spirit. Obviously, one nation could not have three spirits, nor could one dialect be shared by two nationalities. It therefore followed that, regardless of their actual national consciousness, all štokavian-speaking people were Serbs. Karadžić implied as much already in 1814 in his remark on the Serb idioms. It is clear that he was discussing only the štokavian dialect and that he divided it into three basic subdialects, ijekavian, ekavian, and ikavian. As for the third, which Karadžić called "Slavonian," he said that it was spoken "by Serbs of Roman Catholic confession, who live in Slavonia, Croatia, and Dalmatia."⁹ He registered no "Serb-Catholic" speakers of ijekavian, the subdialect used in Dubrovnik, perhaps because of his still imperfect knowledge of the true situation. Twelve years later, after the publication of Šafařík's *Geschichte der slawischen Sprache und Literatur*,¹⁰ Karadžić expressed his gratitude that the author "(with justification) classified the Slavonians, Dalmatians, and Croats (*ours* [that is, štokavians], and not *kajkavians*) among the Serbs, and also the Bosnians and Montenegrins."¹¹ Šafařík's statistics in this and subsequent works provided great leverage to Karadžić and all subsequent proponents of Serbian linguistic nationhood.¹²

9. Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, *Pismenica serbskoga jezika, po govoru prostoga naroda* (Vienna, 1814), p. 105.

10. Pavel Josef Šafařík, *Geschichte der slawischen Sprache und Literatur* (Buda, 1826).

11. Karadžić's letter to Ignjat A. Brlić, April 25, 1826, in *Vukova prepiska*, 5 (Belgrade, 1910): 116.

12. In his 1826 work Šafařík divided the Slavic world into two main branches, southeastern and northwestern. The first included Russian, Serbian, and Croatian "stems." The Serbian "stem" included Bulgars (600,000), Hungarian and Ottoman Serbs (350,000 and 800,000, respectively), Bosnians (350,000), Montenegrins (60,000), Slavonians (500,000), and Dalmatians (300,000 in Austrian Dalmatia and 80,000 in Ottoman Hercegovina). Šafařík included the Slovenes (Wends, pop. 800,000) with the Czechs, Slovaks, Poles, and Sorbs in the northwestern Slavic branch. For a recent critical edition of this work see *Dejiny slovanského jazyka a literatury všech nářečí*, trans. Valéria Bétaková and Rudolf Beták (Bratislava, 1963), pp. 63–68. In his *Slowanský národopis* (Prague, 1842), Šafařík modified his views to a certain extent. He no longer included the Bulgars among the Serbs, counting them instead as one of the two separate South Slavic groups. The other, Illyrian, group included Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes. In an appended statistical table, however, which was later much reproduced, Šafařík maintained his belief in the Serbian

The logical consequence of Karadžić's theories was the claim that Dubrovnik, the major source of national pride because of its past cultural achievements, was in fact an ancient Serb city. But Dubrovnik's record of religious intolerance toward the Orthodox presented a great stumbling block. The republican government had held that state tranquility demanded a single religion. It also had believed in its mission as the Catholic outpost *in partibus infidelium*.¹³ Therefore it had allowed no Orthodox churches, offending several eighteenth-century Russian rulers, and predicated Ragusan naturalization on adherence to the Catholic faith.¹⁴ As a result, there were only a handful of Orthodox inhabitants in Dubrovnik before the French occupation.¹⁵ Though Orthodoxy did not have equal status with Catholicism until 1848, the number of Orthodox increased under Habsburg rule to 380 in 1839, swelled by upwardly mobile Orthodox Hercegovinians, who in time constituted a prosperous merchant class.¹⁶ Their growing Serb national feeling was strengthened by frequent expressions of Catholic disdain toward Orthodoxy, so that it was difficult to convince them that Catholic Ragusans were also Serbs. Nevertheless, it was the spiritual leader of Dubrovnik's Orthodox community who first advanced the idea that the city's Serbs were not limited to his small flock.

Djordje (Georgije) Nikolajević (1807–1896), the first Orthodox parish priest in Dubrovnik and the metropolitan of Dabar-Bosnia after 1885, was undoubtedly one of the most zealous promoters of Serbian national conscious-

character of štokavian. There were only 801,000 Croats, all Catholics, who lived only in the kajkavian area of northwestern Croatia. By contrast, there were 1,151,000 Slovenes and 5,294,000 Serbs (including 2,880,000 Orthodox, 1,864,000 Catholics, and 550,000 Muslims). See *Slovanský národopis*, 4th ed. (Prague, 1955), pp. 146–48. Though Šafařík apparently believed that čakavian had somehow passed into the Serbian linguistic zone, he included a čakavian song among the examples of Croatian language (p. 159).

13. In 1803 four Ragusan senators argued that two itinerant Orthodox priests must be expelled from Dubrovnik because Saint Francis of Assisi had prophesied in 1220 that Dubrovnik would remain independent and prosperous only as long as it excluded the Orthodox. Johann Christian von Engel, *Povjest Dubrovačke Republike* (Dubrovnik, 1903), p. iii.

14. For an Orthodox view of Ragusan policies toward the Eastern Christians see Nikodim Milaš, *Pravoslavna crkva u Dubrovniku u XVIII. i početku XIX. vijeka* (Sarajevo, 1913). The conditions under which the Orthodox lived in Dubrovnik were best described by Gerasim Zelić, a Dalmatian archimandrite, after several unhappy experiences with Count Sednizky, a Polish Catholic who was the chief of police in Vienna: "The Poles are as much the friends of our dispensation as the Ragusans, who — while they had their republic — could not tolerate a Christian of the Eastern Church to spend even one night in their city, but now they have softened, as have Poles." Cited in Nikodim Milaš, *Pravoslavna Dalmacija* (Novi Sad, 1901), p. 529, n. 40.

15. My own reconstruction of various communities listed in the *Maestrello della Popolazione della Città e Borgo*, a 1799 Ragusan census compiled for the purpose of obligatory purchases from the state salt monopoly in the city of Dubrovnik and its most immediate environs, yields 10 (perhaps 12) Orthodox families with 32 (38?) members older than fourteen. This number could also include Catholic servants. All families except one lived outside the city walls and all family heads are explicitly called "*Murlacco*," that is, Vlach, here taken in the Orthodox confessional sense. By contrast, at the same time there were 42 Jewish households, with 209 members, including 38 Christian servants. The total population of Dubrovnik older than fourteen was then 4,479. Under French rule in 1808 the Orthodox population of the entire former territory of Dubrovnik amounted to 68 men and 40 women. Dubrovnik Historical Archives, *Acta Gallica* (1810): Financije 1–150: *Tavola statistica generale della Città di Ragusa, e tutto il suo antico Stato per l'anno 1807*.

16. Djordje Nikolajević, "Srbsko obšestvo u Dubrovniku," *Srbsko-Dalmatinski Magazin* (Zadar), 4 (1839): 133. In 1880, there were 10,920 people in the commune of Dubrovnik. In addition to 10,186 Catholics, there were 656 Orthodox, 67 Jews, 15 Protestants, and 4 Muslims.

ness in Dubrovnik and Dalmatia.¹⁷ Born in Jazak (Srijem county, Croatia-Slavonia) to a family that had produced several priests, he was schooled at the Orthodox gymnasium and later the seminary in Karlovci, the seat of the Serbian metropolitans on Habsburg territory. In the autumn of 1829 he entered the philosophy faculty at the University of Pest, but his studies were soon interrupted at the behest of Metropolitan Stefan Stratimirović, who needed him in Dalmatia.

From the beginning of Habsburg rule in Dalmatia, the Serbian ethnarch had sought to extend his jurisdiction to this newly acquired province where some 80,000 Orthodox lived. Orthodox Dalmatians had recently succeeded in checking the influence of the local Phanariot ordinary who, encouraged by Habsburg authorities, was displaying pro-Uniate sentiments. In the process, however, they had incurred official displeasure, and the religious education of Orthodox children was now virtually forbidden. Seeing the usefulness of an adroit fighter, Stratimirović dispatched the loyal Nikolajević to Dubrovnik as teacher for the growing Orthodox community.

Nikolajević proved astonishingly adept at discharging his task under semilegal conditions without arousing undue suspicions about his allegiance to the constituted government. In 1833, Josif Rajačić, the Orthodox bishop of Dalmatia, ordained Nikolajević as priest in order to strengthen his position with the authorities. Nikolajević immediately gained the sanction for a "catechistic" school, the first Orthodox educational institution in Dalmatia. Since the school's curriculum also included secular subjects (notably history), its confessional formula became the model for all subsequent private Serb national schools in Dalmatia. Nikolajević's activist policies eventually led to the recognition of all Orthodox rights in Dubrovnik.

The nonecclesiastical side of Nikolajević's undertakings was equally impressive. Throughout the 1830s he worked in the Dubrovnik archives as a copyist of Cyrillic diplomatic documents, the originals of which had been appropriated for Vienna's *Haus-, Hof-, und Staatsarchiv*. He used this opportunity to make his own copies and eventually had them published in Belgrade in 1840 under the title *Srbski spomenici* (Serbian Monuments).¹⁸ This first important edition of medieval Balkan Cyrillic sources was Serbian only in part — the Serbs had not been the only users of the Cyrillic script — but it initiated a nineteenth-century scholarly tradition that viewed Dubrovnik as a part of the Serbian historic diapason.

Almost simultaneously Nikolajević's growing knowledge of Dubrovnik's past permitted him to apply Karadžić's theories to the city's literary heritage.

17. For biographies of Nikolajević see Dimitrije Ruvarac, *Životopis Djordja Nikolajevića Mitropolita Dabro-Bosanskog* (Zemun, 1898); Nićifor Dučić, "Mitropolit Djordje Nikolajević," *Godišnjak Srpske Kraljevske akademije* (Belgrade), 9 (1895): 370–75; Jovan L. Perović, "Gjorgje Nikolajević kao budilac narodnog duha i prvi radnik XIX. vijeka u dubrovačkom arhivu," *Dubrovnik* (Dubrovnik), 1 (1925), no. 5: 1–4, and no. 11: 1–2; and Kosta Milutinović, *Vojvodina i Dalmacija, 1760–1914* (Novi Sad, 1973), pp. 51–85.

18. Pavle Karanotvrtković, an Orthodox priest from western Bosnia and Nikolajević's courier, was cited as the edition's compiler. It is not clear whether Nikolajević tried to cover his tracks by suggesting that Karanotvrtković assume the authorship of this illicitly gathered collection or whether Karanotvrtković abused Nikolajević's trust. The provenance of the volume provoked a bitter controversy during which Nikolajević kept silent.

His vehicle was Zadar's *Srbsko-Dalmatinski Magazin*" (*Serbo-Dalmatian Magazine*), first published by Božidar Petranović (1809–1874) in 1836 under a slightly different name. Petranović came from a bourgeois Orthodox family and was one of the first Dalmatian Serbs to be educated in the metropolitan's gymnasium in Karlovci. Though he was an old acquaintance of Gaj from their student days in Graz and a frequent contributor to Gaj's literary weekly, his views were closer to those of Karadžić. In the third volume of his *Magazin*" (1838), Petranović claimed that the "greater part of inhabitants of the Kingdom of Dalmatia [was] of Slavic ancestry and Serb name." The inhabitants of continental Dalmatia (including Dubrovnik) and of the Bay of Kotor were Serbs and spoke the "true Serbian dialect." Because of their dialect, the Serb status of the čakavian islanders was the only matter open to doubt, but Petranović thought that this problem could also be surmounted: "Did they not perhaps retain the old Serbian language over which the Philologists quarrel so much?"¹⁹

The same issue of *Magazin*" contained Nikolajević's article on "Ragusan Writers Who Wrote in Serbian, but with Italian Letters," the first of a series of four articles in which he claimed the entire Ragusan literary corpus for Serbian literature.²⁰ This is a sophistic series, very much limited by the polemical nature of the thesis; its errors and convenient omissions are astounding.²¹ During the next few years (1842–1861, and again in 1869) Nikolajević pursued these ideas from his position as editor of *Magazin*". Petranović and Nikolajević were thus in the avant-garde of supporters of Karadžić's linguistic Serbianism in Dalmatia and Dubrovnik.²²

19. Teodor [Božidar] Petranović, "Geografičesko-statističeski pregled" Dalmacije," *Srbsko-Dalmatinski Magazin*" (Zadar), 3 (1838): 40–42.

20. Djordje Nikolajević, "Spisatel'i dubrovački koi su Srbskim jezikom, a talianskim slovima pisali," *Srbsko-Dalmatinski Magazin*", 3 (1838): 1–7. The other three articles, under slightly different titles, appeared in 1839 (4: 5–13), 1840 (5: 5–14), and 1841 (6: 5–16). In the first article the following poets were explicitly identified as Serbian: Džore Držić, Šišmundo Menčetić, Mavro Vetranović, and Nikola Dimitrović; in the second: Andrija Čubranović, Marin Držić, Miho Bunić Babulinov, Frano Lukarević Burina, Dinko Ranjina, and Dominko Zlatarić. In the third article, Nikolajević suddenly dropped Serbian nomenclature. Thus, Ivan Gundulić, Džono (Junije) Palmotić, Vice Pucić Soltanović, Dživo Gučetić Jerov, and Baro Bettera wrote in "Slavic," Ivan Bunić Sarov in "Ragusan," and Džore Palmotić and Petar Bogašinović in "indigenous" (*domorodan*) language. In the last article Nikolajević returned to his earlier usage and identified Ignjat Djurdjević, Marija Bogašinović-Budmani, Josip Betondić, Franatica Sorkochević, and Luko Bunić as Serb poets. The articles are full of errors in names, dates, and family relations of the poets. More of a chronology than a critical study, the work is noted for wrongheaded appraisals of various authors.

21. One such omission was Nikolajević's treatment of Dominko Zlatarić's translations of foreign classics. Though Nikolajević regularly noted that other poets translated "into Serbian," he could not do so in the case of Zlatarić, who wrote in his subtitle of Sophocles' *Electra* that this "tragedy was translated into Croatian." Nikolajević, therefore, simply dropped his usual formula and introduced the section with the following phrase: "Having seen that Serbian poetry was flowering in his fatherland, [Zlatarić] also devoted himself to it."

22. Nikolajević was probably exposed to Karadžić's views through the offices of Jeremija Gagić (1783–1859), a secretary of Karadjordje's State Council who entered Russian service in 1812 and served as the Russian consul in Dubrovnik from 1815 to 1856. Gagić was Karadžić's friend and correspondent and in 1834 he engaged the parish priest to collect subscribers for Karadžić's book of proverbs. Marko Nikolić, "Jedan Karadžićev 'Prenumerant,'" *Vesnik Saveza udruženja pravoslavnog sveštenstva FNRJ* (Belgrade), 10 (1958), no. 206: 4. Nikolajević probably made Karadžić's acquaintance in 1838, when Karadžić stayed in Gagić's home during his sojourn in Dubrovnik.

The "Serb-Catholic" idea could not exercise much influence among those at whom it was directed as long as no Catholic native to Dubrovnik openly espoused it. The first to do so was an impressive — and impressionable — convert. Medo Pucić (Orsatto Pozza, 1821–1882), scion of an ancient noble family, applied his considerable fortune to cultural pursuits in western Europe and was one of the Ragusans exposed to Italian romantic nationalism. Though conservative in his social views, Pucić adopted those elements of Italian national messianism that he thought could serve the cause of Slavic revivals. His hatred was directed more at monarchical and absolutist Vienna than at the democratic radicals, and he viewed his new mission as a kind of service that justified his dwindling estate. His devout Catholicism proved no obstacle to his romantic nationalism; unlike many Catholic Ragusans, he did not harbor any animosity toward the Orthodox.

The year 1841 was highly important for Pucić's ideological evolution. As a law student at Padua he befriended Jan Kollár, who was then staying in Venice. The Slovak philologist and prophet of Slavic reciprocity admired Pucić as a refreshing youth "of lofty cast, noble spirit, and great poetic ability."²³ Pucić may well have received the rudiments of Šafařík's and Kollár's teachings on the South Slavic dialects at the very source; there is ample evidence that he was already familiar with Karadžić's views on the subject. In 1842–1844 he wrote a series of articles on Slavic affairs for the Triestine journal *Favilla* (Spark), among them one (1843) based on Šafařík's 1842 claim that there were only 801,000 Croats, all in kajkavian Croatia.²⁴ As early as 1841, however, Pucić had written a programmatic poem, part of a cycle called "Bosanske davorije" (Bosnian Songs), which included the following stanzas, the first unambiguous statement of Serb national sentiment by a Catholic Ragusan:

Mladi Srbi bud'mo mi
 Braća jedne misli svi,
 Misli sloge, misli slave,
 Misli ljubve bratske prave,
 U nas gleda narod sav!

.....

Neka pravi Srbin svak
 Dobro pamti naš barjak;
 On je modar, crven, bio,
 Medj ociljem krstaš mio;
 U nas gleda narod sav.

Young Serbs let us be
 Brothers of one idea all,
 Idea of unity, idea of glory,
 Idea of true fraternal love,
 All the people are watching us!

.....

23. Jan Kollár, "Domoljubi u Mletcib," *Danica Horvatska, slavonska i dalmatinska* (Zagreb), 9 (1843), no. 50: 198.

24. Bernard Stulli, "Tršćanska 'Favilla' i Južni Slaveni," *Anali Jadranskog instituta JAZU* (Zagreb), 1 (1956): 39–40, 48.

Let every true Serb
 Well remember our flag;
 It is blue, red, and white,
 Flintstones circle the tender cross;
 All the people are watching us.²⁵

At approximately the same time in Bursa (Anatolia) another Catholic from Dubrovnik, later a self-declared “childhood comrade” of Pucić, was moving in the same direction. Matija Ban (1818–1903) was one of the oddest personalities in nineteenth-century Serbian history. His underhanded plotting, political opportunism, and thirst for distinctions earned him an unsavory reputation that has detracted from his considerable political accomplishments. A Serbian historian recently described him as an individual of “deeply embedded, immutable moral blindness.”²⁶ Ban’s motives were questioned even when they happened to be honorable — the fate of all self-seekers.

Ban was born into a poor family in Petrovo Selo, a village not far from the city’s new harbor of Gruž.²⁷ He received the best secondary education that could be obtained in early nineteenth-century Dubrovnik. Andjeo Maslač (1772–1838), a learned Dominican rhetorician of inconstant political allegiances and reputedly the only contemporary Ragusan who could use Cyrillic script, was his tutor in philosophy.²⁸ Ban himself entered the seminary in 1834 but found that he had no priestly vocation and left the clerical estate in 1836, despite Maslač’s attempts to gain the talented youth, already an enthusiastic writer of poetry and dramas, for the Dominican order. For several years thereafter Ban busied himself as a scrivener. In 1839, following a disappointment in love, he left for Turkey, vowing never to return to his native land. Ban worked briefly as a teacher of Italian, but in 1840 he married a Greek woman and used her dowry to buy an estate near Bursa, where he studied, wrote, and cultivated silkworms.

It was while living in the environs of the Ottoman capital that Ban encountered the Polish emigration. After the defeat of the Polish insurrection in 1831, some 9,000 Poles — insurgent leaders, intellectuals, and even ordinary participants — had found refuge abroad. From his headquarters at the Hôtel Lambert in Paris, Prince Adam Czartoryski, the leader of the constitutional-monarchical faction of the Great Emigration, in 1841 authorized the formation of a Polish agency in Istanbul as part of his plan to exploit the hazardous Eastern Question to the advantage of the Polish cause. Keenly aware that the restoration of Poland depended on isolating Russia diplomatically, Czartoryski wanted to make certain that, in the event Ottoman power in the Balkans collapsed, the emerging successor state(s) would not be the pawns of St. Petersburg. The new

25. Medo Pucić, *Pjesme* (Pančevo, 1879), p. 306. The actual order of Serbian colors is red, blue, and white.

26. Vojislav J. Vučković, “Neuspela politička akcija Matije Bana 1860–1861,” *Istoriski časopis* (Belgrade), 9–10 (1959): 385.

27. For accounts of Ban’s political and literary activities see Jovan Bošković in “Izvodi iz zapisnika Srpskog učenoga društva,” *Glasnik Srpskoga učenog društva* (Belgrade), 65 (1886): 11–35; Kamila Lucerna, “U spomen Matije Bana Dubrovčanina,” *Ljetopis JAZU* (Zagreb), 21 (1907): 120–68; Jovan Skerlić, *Istorija nove srpske književnosti* (Belgrade, 1921), pp. 199–201.

28. For a biography of Maslač see Agostino Giurgevich (Augustin Djurdjević), *Cenni biografico-letariii dei personaggi più illustri della Congregazione ragusina di San Domenico* (Split, 1867), pp. 31–32.

agency in Istanbul was headed by Michał Czajkowski (1804–1886), a poet of Ukrainian origin who until 1836 had belonged to the democratic republican faction of the Polish emigration.²⁹ There is substantial evidence that Matija Ban developed close ties with this outpost of the Hôtel Lambert.³⁰

Czajkowski's arrival in Istanbul coincided with the appearance there of several leading Serbian Constitutionalists (*Ustavobranitelji*), including Toma Vučić-Perišić (1787?–1859) and Avram Petronijević (1791–1852). The Constitutionalists were a coterie of notables who had opposed the despotic rule of Miloš Obrenović, the prince of autonomous Serbia. In 1838 they had prompted the Porte to impose a constitution which, though not at all democratic or representative, did limit the prince's power. Their influence waned after Miloš's abdication and exile in 1839 to the point that Mihailo, Miloš's younger son and successor, succeeded in having them banished in 1840.

Vučić and Petronijević were thus determined to depose Mihailo, and they soon found that Czajkowski and the other agents of the Hôtel Lambert were eager to assist them in this project. Mihailo's faithful allegiance to St. Petersburg determined the Poles' attitude. They counseled the exiled Serbs to shun Russia and instead to rely on Ottoman favor and their own forces, and on the French and British help that Czartoryski could obtain. Indeed, Czartoryski's enterprises were the unofficial policy of Orléanist France, which supported Polish efforts to convince Habsburg and Ottoman Slavs that their aspirations could not be served by St. Petersburg.

The Constitutionalists were apparently persuaded. When Vučić and Petronijević returned to Belgrade in 1842, their entourage included Ludwik Zwierkowski, a Polish agent who lived with Petronijević and "ceaselessly spoke and counseled that the Serbs renounce Russian protection, because should Serbia not do so, it will be ruined just like Poland, and the Serbs will become Russian serfs and slaves."³¹ In the late summer of 1842 (August 31–September 2) the Constitutionalists overthrew Prince Mihailo in the so-called Vučić Rebellion, which was supported by the Porte. Thereafter, the Constitutionalists ruled through Aleksandar Karadjordjević (1806–1885), the head of the rival princely family.

Since St. Petersburg opposed the reign of Prince Aleksandar, the Hôtel Lambert mobilized its extensive connections in an attempt to bolster the new regime. By 1844 Czartoryski felt confident enough to consider Serbia the standard-bearer of the South Slavs. He envisioned the emergence, after the overthrow of Ottoman rule in the Balkans, of a powerful Serbian state backed by France — a state that would be a barrier to Russian and Austrian influences and an ally of the Polish independence movement. To this end, Czartoryski urged Ilija Garašanin (1812–1874), the Serbian minister of the interior who emerged as the leading personality of the Constitutionalist government, to further friendly relations with the South Slavs of the Habsburg Monarchy and

29. The most up-to-date work on this question is Jerzy Skowronek, *Polityka bałkańska Hotelu Lambert (1833–1856)* (Warsaw, 1976); see esp. pp. 15–118.

30. Ljubomir Đurković-Jakšić, *Srbijansko-crnogorska saradnja (1830–1851)* (Belgrade, 1957), pp. 66–67.

31. From a letter of Janićije Djurić, Karadjordje's former secretary, cited in Dragoslav Stranjaković, "Kako je postalo Garašaninovo 'Načertanije,'" *Spomenik SKA* (Belgrade), 91 (1939): 67.

Bosnia-Hercegovina. As a corollary, the Hôtel Lambert promoted church union in the hope that Orthodox Slavs would be freed from Russian influence. Czartoryski also hoped that the introduction of the popular language into Catholic liturgy in Bosnia, where Polish agents had developed close ties with the Franciscan order, would counter Habsburg influence.³²

Czartoryski's ideas guided the powerful Polish agency in Belgrade, which was directed by František Zach (1807–1892). This Moravian adherent of Kollár's romantic idea of Slavic reciprocity became Czartoryski's chief representative in Belgrade in 1843.³³ Soon after his arrival in Serbia, Zach composed a memorandum on Serbia's policy which he thrust upon Garašanin. The Constitutionalist leader adopted large parts of the memorandum practically word for word and incorporated them into the famous *Načertanije* ("Outline") of 1844, the secret Serbian national program that applied until the establishment of Yugoslavia. But though Garašanin had no objections to most of Zach's ideas, including his persistent exhortations in favor of Serbia's political and economic independence, he changed all references to cooperation with the other South Slavs, omitted entire sections (for example, on Serbia's relations with Croatia), altered others (allowing, for example, an alliance with Russia, but at the price of Russian support of Serbia's expansion), and stressed that Serbia "must not be confined to its present frontiers, but should instead strive to attach to itself all Serb peoples who encircle it."³⁴

Garašanin's conception was clearly expansionist and assimilationist. Though he accepted Zach's recommendation that Bosnian Franciscans be used to further the "idea of unification of Bosnia with Serbia," he plainly considered the Croats of Bosnia-Hercegovina to be "linguistic" Serbs. Zach, however, also shared this view. He believed that štokavian was a mark of the Serbs and therefore concluded that Gaj's introduction of the štokavian dialect into kajkavian Croatia constituted a victory for the Serbs because, though "the Croats and their closest Slavic neighbors use the Latin letters, their literary language is day by day becoming more Serbian."³⁵ The difference was that although Zach believed in a Great Serbia (based on the linguistic definition of nationhood) with a special mission, he still adhered to the principle of Slavic reciprocity. He wanted a Great Serbia in harmony with the larger Slavic world. To Garašanin, Serbia alone mattered.

Serbia's minister of the interior stood midway between the Orthodox traditionalists, who had no use for neophyte "Catholic Serbs," and Zach's romantic circle, which wanted a Great Serbia within the renaissance Slavic world. Garašanin had no misgivings about the new conception of Serbian linguistic nationhood, but he rightly believed that the affirmation of this idea, part of his goal of an "overall unification of all Serbs and [their] provinces into one,"³⁶

32. Jaroslav Šidak, "Hôtel Lambert i Hrvati," *Studije iz hrvatske povijesti XIX stoljeća* (Zagreb, 1973), pp. 168–70. Compare Skowronek, pp. 92–93.

33. On Zach's activities among the South Slavs in the 1840s see two works by Václav Žáček: *František A. Zach* (Prague, 1977), pp. 39–94, and "Suradnja Ljudevita Gaja s Františkom Zachom," *Radovi Instituta za hrvatsku povijest* (Zagreb), 3 (1973): 139–59.

34. Stranjaković, p. 75. For historiographic views on the problem of the authorship and interpretation of *Načertanije*, see Nikša Stančić, "Problem 'Načertanija' Ilije Garašanina u našoj historiografiji," *Historijski zbornik* (Zagreb), 21–22 (1968–1969): 179–96.

35. Stranjaković, p. 94.

36. *Ibid.*, p. 87.

could not be reconciled with the aims of Croat Illyrianists, something that Zach evidently (and naively) thought possible — in part because he misread Gaj's intentions. Matija Ban found himself caught in the traffic between Garašanin's policy and Zach's fancy-weaving.

Ban's increasing restlessness was probably prompted by his contacts with the agents of the Hôtel Lambert. In 1844 he sold his estate and went to Belgrade, probably at Zach's invitation.³⁷ Though Ban referred to himself as a "Slav from Dubrovnik" in his poetic salutation to "mother Serbia" (1844), there is no doubt that he was already convinced of his linguistic Serbianism, an idea that was already prevalent among the emissaries of the Hôtel Lambert. The same idea was a novelty in a purely Serbian setting, however, and Ban's enthusiasm for things Serbian apparently aroused considerable suspicion — much to his dismay. Serbian traditionalists were ever on guard, even against Orthodox Serbs from Croatia and southern Hungary. Their mistrustfulness was heightened in dealings with Catholic Slavs, whom the Serbs often considered hostile to integral Orthodoxy (as Czartoryski indeed was).

Ban's reactions to his new surroundings are obvious from a letter he wrote in late December 1844 to Aleksandar Banović, a fellow Ragusan who worked as a schoolteacher in Valjevo:

As you can see, the Serbs in these parts most often limit their patriotism to the Principality [of Serbia], while the Serbs from Hungary limit it to Serbdom alone and then within very narrow [confessional?] frontiers. They do not wish to know anything about the other South Slavs and pay no attention to them. We shall not get very far with such narrow views. The horizon of national thought must be widened and Serbia must be made the chief leader of the South Slavs. We, several patriots here [Belgrade], swore to accomplish that goal and we shall certainly not violate our oath. . . . Remember that the Ragusans were once enlighteners in these parts and that we must now continue the work of our fathers.³⁸

The group of patriots, whose names Ban listed, were members of Zach's secret circle. It is characteristic that only one of the eight members mentioned was native to Serbia; the rest, including Ban and Zach, were all outsiders. Two were former Catholic seminarians (Ban and Pajo Čavlović, Ljudevit Gaj's confidant and go-between in Belgrade), and one was a former Franciscan friar from Bosnia (Tomo Kovačević). Another member, Jan Šafařík, a nephew of P. J. Šafařík, was a Slovak Protestant physician who taught at the Belgrade lycée.

With the help of the "excellent minister Garašanin [who] promised [the group] his protection and aid," the secret circle was able to work its way into the upper reaches of Serbian political life. Ban, for example, became the tutor of Prince Aleksandar's daughters in 1845. The counsel of other members was sought by Garašanin and several other ministers, and their influence grew among the students and in the press. The challenge of the group, which

37. Ljubomir Đurković-Jakšić, *Branislav: Prvi jugoslovenski ilegalni list, 1844–1845* (Belgrade, 1968), p. 41; Skowronek, p. 91.

38. Arhiv Istoriskog instituta SAN: Fond Matije Bana (hereafter AII:MB), p. 13, Letter to Aleksandar Banović, Belgrade, December 10, 1844 (O.S.).

systematically countered Russian interests and for the most part advocated a new concept of Serbian nationhood and Serbia's active engagement in South Slavic affairs, was duly met by the Orthodox traditionalists. Jovan Sterija Popović (1806–1856), Serbia's pioneer comic dramatist and chief of education, started a public polemic against Ban; Sterija's supporters joined in, and the argument dragged on in the pages of official Serbian newspapers.

Ban described this debate as nothing less than the "struggle of old and narrow ideas about literature and nationality with the newer and wider concepts."³⁹ He was apprehensive about insinuations that the circle was an agency of "Roman propaganda" and was especially alarmed at the attacks against the "Croats and their Western church": "It would be sheer madness, from the national and political viewpoint, to attack from Serbia and in its official press the religion confessed by a portion of the Serbs themselves and almost all the Croats. How would this affect the spirits in Bosnia, Hercegovina, Dalmatia, and many other Slavic lands? What would the foreign consuls in Belgrade say about this?"⁴⁰ He wanted Garašanin to intervene with the censors to make certain that such articles were regularly withheld. The entire affair was part of the larger "war for a Serbian language" which the traditional Serbian forces, backed by the Orthodox church, mounted against Vuk Karadžić.⁴¹

The activity of Zach's secret circle was the basis for a network of agents charged with gathering information on the political outlook, military strength, and disposition toward Serbia of the South Slavs. Modeled on Czartoryski's network, such an intelligence force was envisioned in Zach's plan and was then adopted in Garašanin's *Načertanije*.⁴² But it commenced in earnest only in 1848–1849, during the great upheaval that set the South Slavs in opposition to Hungary.

In the revolutionary events of these two years, the Serbian government was actively engaged on the side of the Habsburg South Slavs. Hungarian demands for a government responsible to the Diet had to be granted by the Emperor after the overthrow of Metternich in March 1848, but the downfall of absolutism only strengthened the Magyar drive for supremacy in the Hungarian crownlands. As a result, the Serbs of southern Hungary began to seize local administrations and, with the support of Patriarch Josif Rajačić, demanded a special Serbian principality (Vojvodina). In Croatia-Slavonia, the Illyrian party called for appointment of the popular Baron Josip Jelačić as Ban of Croatia, unification of all Habsburg Croat lands (Croatia-Slavonia, the Military Frontier, Dalmatia, and Rijeka), appointment of a government independent of Hungary and responsible to a representative Croatian Sabor (Diet), and the abolition of serfdom. Once in office, Jelačić became convinced that Hungarians would never accede to Croat aspirations. With the encouragement of Vienna, he decided on military action against Hungary, provoking in turn the Hungarian war of independence.

In order to bring about closer cooperation between Serbs and Croats, Matija Ban commenced a three-month journey in March 1848 that took him to

39. AII:MB, p. 18, Letter to Stefan Herkalović, Belgrade, January 2, 1845 (O.S.).

40. Ibid.

41. Miodrag Popović, *Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, 1787–1864*, 2nd ed. (Belgrade, 1972), pp. 315–20.

42. Stranjaković, pp. 80–81.

Srijem, Zagreb, Dalmatia (including his native Dubrovnik, which he visited for the first time in nine years), Montenegro, and back to Belgrade by way of Trieste, Ljubljana, and Zagreb. The information about this political tour is based largely on a series of letters that Ban addressed to Stevan Petrović Knjčanin, later the commander of Serbian troops against Kossuth's Hungarians.⁴³ These letters are in many ways extremely unreliable; it is possible that they are wholly fictitious, and if they are not, Ban certainly made a great many alterations in them after Knjčanin and the other principals mentioned were dead, even inventing incidents that inflated his own importance.⁴⁴ But even with these serious shortcomings, the letters are useful for the information they provide on Ban's intentions and on actions that can be verified by other sources. This is especially the case in reconstructing Ban's role in the developments in Dalmatia.

The enthusiasm aroused by the fall of Metternich and the progress of revolution in Lombardy and Venetia increased pro-Italian sentiment, ever a threat to the Slavic cause in Dalmatia. Elements within the Italianized bourgeoisie, especially in Zadar and Split, clamored for unification with the Venetian Republic of Daniele Manin. Dalmatian democrats, though they were in fact pro-Italian, gained adherents by campaigning with radical slogans favoring the abolition of the colonate land-tenure system, thus effectively neutralizing Croat attempts to unify Dalmatia with northern Croatia.⁴⁵ Dubrovnik and Kotor were exceptions to this trend, but supporters of unification still faced difficulties. Matija Ban's main task during his 1848 spring journey was to bolster the notion that the "great future of Dalmatia stands only in unity with Croatia."⁴⁶ But despite the Slavic overtones of his propaganda, he also injected a note of Serb particularity into his work, the first open agitation on behalf of the "Serb-Catholic" idea in Dubrovnik. As Ban explained in his letter from Dubrovnik (May 8, 1848, O.S.): "In Dubrovnik . . . the commanders of the national guard, which was introduced throughout Dalmatia, accepted Serbian as the language of command, and on the streets of Dubrovnik the youths by night sing Serbian songs which I taught them, including one which I created specially for my Ragusans."⁴⁷ That song was Ban's "Serbo-Ragusan hymn," which began with the following lines:

43. The letters were published in Radoslav Perović, ed., *Gradja za istoriju srpskog pokreta u Vojvodini, 1848-1849*, 1 (Belgrade, 1952); see pp. 31, 72-73, 81-82, 112-14, 131-32, 135-36, 148, 207-208, 216-17, 238-39, 274-75, 306-307, 344-45, 404-405.

44. Vučković proved this beyond any reasonable doubt. See Vučković, pp. 383-84. For example, Ban says that he met Jelačić and Gaj on or several days before March 31 (1848, O.S.), but this meeting cannot have occurred for both Croat leaders were then in Vienna. And if he did not meet Jelačić, it is not likely that he carried Jelačić's message to Petar II Petrović-Njegoš, the ruler of Montenegro, as he claims in a letter from Split on April 22 (O.S.). R. Perović, p. 217.

45. Stijepo Obad, "Lijeve tendencije u dubrovačkom previranju 1848-1849. godine," *Go-dišnjak Društva istoričara BiH* (Sarajevo), 16 (1965): 91-100.

46. The words are from Ban's proclamation to the Dalmatians, distributed as a leaflet in April 1848. See "Šta treba Dalmaciji?" in Perović, pp. 136-338. Ban expressed similar sentiments in his essay "Domovini mojoj," *Danica horvatska, slavonska i dalmatinska*, 14 (1848), no. 21: 86-87.

47. R. Perović, p. 307.

Ja sam Srbin, staroga
Dubrovnika sin,
Prva uma iskrica
Slavenima svim;
.....

I am a Serb, the son
Of ancient Dubrovnik,
The first spark of intellect
To all the Slavs;⁴⁸
.....

Meanwhile, the Court had appointed Jelačić governor of Dalmatia, uniting the two Croat provinces in his person. In addition, the lifting of censorship permitted the growth of a free press, including Dubrovnik's notable *L'Avvenire*, the "newspaper of the highest intellectual level in the Croat lands in 1848," which commenced publication in August 1848.⁴⁹ Though its editor, Ivan August Kaznačić (1817–1883), Pucić's colleague and friend from university days in Padua and Venice, referred to his weekly as a "*foglio croato scritto in italiano*," he reprinted Pucić's version of Šafařík's statistics on the numerical standing of the Slavs from the 1843 *Favilla* (in which Kaznačić had collaborated with Pucić in the publication of the series on the Slavs). Aside from this display of Kaznačić's Illyrianist liberality and devotion to a schoolmate, however, no other manifestation of "Serb-Catholicism" appeared in *L'Avvenire* until 1849.

In February 1849 *L'Avvenire* printed the first installment of Ban's inquiry into Slavic political questions written in Belgrade "*alla fine del 1848*," in which he continued his attack on the Dalmatian pro-Italians and argued in favor of unification with Croatia-Slavonia. The essay also emphasized "Serb-Catholic" themes by praising Gaj's "brave Croats" who adopted the Serbian dialect and giving cautionary advice on the "importance of the Adriatic to the Serbo-Illyrians."⁵⁰ In the seventh installment Ban lauded the genius of nationalism which he predicted would become the soul of humanity, as languages marked the future frontiers of European nations (*le lingue segneranno i loro confini*).⁵¹ In March 1849 *L'Avvenire* reprinted an essay by Medo Pucić calling on the Croats to put aside hopes of independence and freedom because of their small number and to throw in their lot with the other Slavs, presumably the Serbs.⁵² Both Ban and Pucić returned to Dubrovnik in the course of the year, and Nikolajević, active since the fall of absolutism in furthering the liberties of Dubrovnik's Orthodox community, then entered into covert relations with Ban. The promoters of the "Serb-Catholic" idea were thus joined in a political interest group.

48. Matija Ban, *Različne pjesme* (Belgrade, 1892), p. 161.

49. Josip Horvat, *Povijest novinstva Hrvatske* (Zagreb, 1962), pp. 154–55.

50. Matija Ban, "Esame delle questioni politico-slave," *L'Avvenire* (Dubrovnik), 1 (1849), no. 27: 105, no. 29: 115.

51. *L'Avvenire*, 1 (1849), no. 33: 129.

52. "O Croati, o Slavoni? Quanti siete in tutto? Senza i confini illirico-tedeschi, non arrivate a un milione, a volete voi, tra il mescersi e il riorganizzarsi di tutta quasi la razza umana, volete, dico, voi, un milione di uomini, salvare la vostra indipendenza e libertà? Persuadetevi, ciò non può essere, rimarete zero, ed altri di voi più potenti v'affibbieranno di bel nuovo la loro cifra, il loro nome, l'istoria loro. Non vi rimane dunque che unirvi ad altri." Orsato Pozza (Počić) [Medo Pucić], "Formiamo noi una nazione?" *L'Avvenire*, 1 (1849), no. 35: 140.

Ilija Garašanin, who viewed the war between Vienna and the Hungarians as an encouraging turn for Serbia's ambitions, finally authorized plans for an extensive intelligence and propaganda agency that would take advantage of Habsburg preoccupation with Hungary to prepare a Christian uprising against the Turks. In one of his letters from the period Ban takes credit for urging this idea upon Garašanin, saying that the minister invited him to propose a plan for Serbia's covert activities and approved his proposal in May 1849.⁵³ The plan called for two subsidiary agencies, one for the southwest and one for the southeast. In addition to gathering information on trustworthy collaborators and their armed strength, the agencies were to disseminate Garašanin's political propaganda and organize insurgent units. The Serbian government financed the entire undertaking. Ban was appointed head of the southwestern agency, headquartered in Dubrovnik, and given responsibility for Bosnia-Herzegovina, contacts with Njegoš and the Catholic Mirdite clan of northern Albania, and propaganda centers in Dalmatia. His counterpart in the southeastern agency, with headquarters in Belgrade, was Tomo Kovačević. Stjepan Verković, another former Bosnian Franciscan, was Ban's courier.⁵⁴

Ban's extensive dealings with Njegoš need not concern us here. His second visit to Dubrovnik within the year was, however, notable because of the part he played in the surge of Serbian propaganda in the city. Kaznačić's *L'Avvenire* had suspended publication late in March 1849, both because it found itself unable to maintain its liberal and federalist policy after the promulgation of the centralist Stadion constitution of March 4, 1849 and because it was confronted with accusations that it harbored anti-Russian sentiments — hardly a politic view at the time of the tsarist intervention in Hungary.⁵⁵ Ban succeeded in gathering the main Ragusan intellectuals around a new literary annual, *Dubrovnik*, whose first issue appeared in late 1849. The new journal was devoted mainly to Pucić's poetry and literary criticism and to Ban's historiographic and linguistic studies. Aided by Nikolajević, Ban at the same time continued his covert activities, recruiting agents for work in Herzegovina and the Bosnian-Dalmatian frontier areas.⁵⁶

By the beginning of 1850 the international situation was drastically altered, and Ban's activities in Dubrovnik and its environs were becoming increasingly risky. The Habsburg Monarchy remained unchallenged after the unconditional surrender of the Hungarian revolutionary armies, and Garašanin's plans for an insurrection in the Ottoman Balkans now seemed utterly impracticable. Though Zach remained in Belgrade, the Hôtel Lambert, stunned by the events of 1848–1849, had given up all hopes of achieving Czartoryski's "Balkan utopia." In Dubrovnik, Ban's very presence provoked the suspicion of the authorities. Although he had brought his entire family with him, it was known that he had assumed Serbian citizenship in 1844. To be sure, the Austrian police in Dubrovnik were not as efficient as their subsequent reputation might indicate: Nikola-

53. AII:MB, pp. 51–53, Letter to Djuro Ban, Belgrade, May 9, 1849 (O.S.).

54. Ibid. For a detailed appraisal of Ban's part in Garašanin's agency, see Dragoslav Stranjaković, *Politička propaganda Srbije u jugoslovenskim pokrajinama 1844–1858 godine* (Belgrade, 1936), pp. 4–23.

55. Ivan August Kaznačić, *Alcune pagine su Ragusa* (Dubrovnik, 1881), pp. 73–76.

56. Durković-Jakšić, *Srbijansko-crnogorska saradnja*, p. 108.

jević was even decorated in 1850 for his services to the monarchy.⁵⁷ Nevertheless, Ban had thought it politic to request Austrian repatriation and had even solicited — and apparently won — the position of Austrian consul in Mostar.⁵⁸ By 1850, however, the police were monitoring his activities, though they still had not detected his actual role.⁵⁹ In March 1850 he went on orders to Belgrade, leaving Nikolajević to carry on affairs in Dubrovnik.⁶⁰

The summons to Belgrade was in fact the final act in the work of the southwestern agency. Garašanin ordered the suspension of all operations and told Ban that he must return to Belgrade for good. In a letter to Njegoš in May 1850, Ban noted that he listened to Garašanin's words "as a prisoner receiving a death sentence." He confessed that his protestations were in vain and that he finally "bent his head" after realizing that further agitation and possible insurgency would only compromise Serbia and Montenegro and lead to much bloodshed. On his own authority, he resolved to maintain a skeleton crew of agents, but even this was apparently prohibited.⁶¹ In another letter to a friend in Dalmatia, written in August 1850, Ban expressed his bitterness at Garašanin's decision to forbid the operation of a printing press that Ban had received from Njegoš and that he hoped to transfer to Dubrovnik. Though Ban finally gave in to the pleadings of Garašanin, Knićanin, Prince Aleksandar, and Princess Persida and accepted a lectureship in French at the Belgrade lycée, he did not despair for the future. He went on with the journal *Dubrovnik*, issuing two more numbers in 1851 and 1852 from Gaj's printing office in Zagreb. Certain that Serbia's policy must eventually change, he left his family in Dubrovnik.⁶² Reflecting on the advances of Serb national consciousness on the littoral during the past two years, he stressed the need for continued work, resolving that he would "not allow the Serbians to sleep and to limit all their worries to the Principality, as they are generally inclined to do. They are patriotic, but their patriotism must be encouraged. . . . In dealings with our Serbians one must have sharp teeth, but, at the same time, one must be prudently toothed."⁶³

Ban's presentiments on the growth of Serb national consciousness in Dubrovnik and southern Dalmatia were on the whole accurate. By the 1880s the "Serb-Catholic" feeling had grown so strong and so familiar to a sizable group of Ragusan intellectuals that the origins of the circle in the 1840s and the early 1850s were all but forgotten, even by historians.⁶⁴ By the end of the nineteenth century, however, linguistic Serbianism had become a political movement that was openly hostile to the Croats, and its leaders welcomed the cooperation of Dalmatian autonomists, the descendants of the pro-Italian bourgeoisie of the

57. Dubrovnik Historical Archives, Protocolo-riservati 1850, nos. 36, 52, and 196.

58. Stranjaković, *Politička propaganda*, pp. 25–26; Đurković-Jakšić, *Srbijansko-crnogorska saradnja*, p. 110.

59. Dubrovnik Historical Archives, Protocolo-riservati 1850, no. 318.

60. Stranjaković, *Politička propaganda*, p. 27.

61. See AII:MB, pp. 58–59, Letter to Petar II Petrović-Njegoš, Dubrovnik, May 6, 1850 (O. S.).

62. Ibid., pp. 60–61, Letter to Špiro Popović, Belgrade, August 7, 1850 (O.S.).

63. Ibid., p. 60.

64. For example, Pavle Popović, the noted Serbian literary historian, wrote that "the Serb movement appeared in Dubrovnik around 1880. The movement was spontaneous, without any outside influence, and sprouted purely on the Ragusan soil." See his essay "Dum Ivan Stojanović," *Nova iskra* (Belgrade), 2 (1900), no. 10: 293.

1840s, who had themselves become more or less covert Italian irredentists. To a very great extent, moreover, the "Serb-Catholic" group had lost the sense of its own novelty — the quality so important to its founders that it behooves us to examine more closely those features of their thought which locate their concerns midway between romantic and integral nationalisms.

The most strikingly distinctive aspect of early "Serb-Catholicism" was the awareness that its promoters had stumbled upon something new. Though Nikolajević, for example, showed no reluctance to label the language of Dubrovnik as Serbian, he found it necessary to note that "this language is completely different from what the foreigners held it to be and perhaps still do hold it."⁶⁵ And Ban could not help inserting the following footnote below his poem "To the Serbian Mother," which he published in *Dubrovnik* in 1851:

Until now, in these parts of ours and practically everywhere else, the Serb name indicated only that part of our tribe which follows the Eastern church. This deadly thought disappeared especially during the most recent events, so that we have now realized that all of us who speak the Serbian dialect [štokavian] are Serbs, whether or not we belong to the Eastern or Western church, to the Christian or Turkish faith. Just as one people differs from another only in language, so also one tribe differs from another only in dialect. And just as many peoples and many tribes can confess one faith, so also one people alone can confess more than one faith without denying its genetic unity. The French are not all of one faith, but they are nevertheless one people. The Germans are also not all of one faith, but they also are nevertheless one people. This also holds for the Serbs. Some of us belong to the Eastern church, some to the Western, some are Uniates, and some have gone over to the Turkish faith, but are for all that no less Serbs. All of us to whom the Serbian dialect is mother tongue compose the Serbian tribe.⁶⁶

This rather remarkable expression of Ban's astonishment at discovering Dubrovnik's "genuine" national standing bears the imprint of the scientific attitude that was the Enlightenment's gift to the essentially romantic theory of linguistic nationhood. Although the notion that scholars should chart the "correct" national orientation of a people did not come into its own until the turn toward naturalism in the late nineteenth century, its origins are evident here. The proponents of "Serb-Catholicism" faced numerous difficulties in the exposition of their proposals because their assumed authority to establish the criteria for national differentiation contradicted the romantic ideal of commitment to cultural authenticity. In all such cases they elected to rely on the authority of experts, ancient or modern. Thus in addition to the Slavistic authorities, who insisted that štokavian was strictly a Serbian dialect, they cited the claim of the tenth-century emperor-historian Constantine Porphyrogenitus, which sets the border of Croatia and Serbia at the Cetina river.⁶⁷ From the scientific viewpoint

65. Nikolajević, "Spisatel'i dubrovački," *Srbsko-Dalmatinski Magazin*, 3 (1838): 2.

66. Matija Ban, "Materi srbskoj," *Dubrovnik: Cvet narodnog književstva* (Zagreb), 2 (1851): 184–85.

67. *De Administrando Imperio*, chapt. 30, ll. 113–16. Constantine Porphyrogenitus' delineation was clearly at work in Ban's project, titled the "Political Foundations of the South Slavs," which

the weight of historical and philological evidence was overwhelming. In the words of a "Serb-Catholic" polemicist from the turn-of-the-century period, "What matters more in [the] science [of national differentiation]? A hundred thousand boors, zealots, and opportunists, or . . . one scientist?"⁶⁸

Nationalism used "scientific" propaganda to fashion a revolution in national consciousness throughout Europe. Ban, for example, was especially aware that "scientific proofs" were indispensable for the spread of "Serb-Catholic" propaganda; and as a man of extravagant fancy, all too sensitive to stage effect, he knew the value of propaganda. In his 1849–1850 constitution on Serbian propaganda, which he submitted to Garašanin, Ban noted that "whatever [Serbia] desires to undertake in the future, she will never succeed without propaganda. And with propaganda, everything can be gained with less effort, bloodshed, and expense. Therefore, propaganda and more propaganda."⁶⁹

This approach to national assimilation through propaganda suggests the circle's affinities to — and divergencies from — the national ideology of Vuk Karadžić. The dependence of Nikolajević, Pucić, and Ban upon Karadžić's linguistic Serbianism has already been noted. But Karadžić's struggle against the Serbian linguistic conservatives and his insistence on the pure "language of the people" represented a total negation of Serbian church-bound literary tradition. Such an erasure of heritage was impossible in the Ragusan setting, not only because the city's classic works of imagination were considerably more "popular" than the literature of Orthodox Serbs. The Ragusan literary inheritance was so prestigious that the task of the "Serb-Catholics" was to connect its classic achievements with the new spirit of nationalism.

Here was a task that had much in common with the aims implicit in the linguistic ideas of the Illyrianists. Indeed, quite like the Illyrianists, Ban considered Karadžić's linguistic purism an extreme tendency. He himself favored the blending of dialects within a new Serbian koine. Because the Illyrianists opted for štokavian, Ban fancied that the great destiny, and merit, of the Zagreb philological school was its resolve "to bring forth a completed, confluenced, beautified, and fully perfected Serbian dialect from its nest to the all-Illyrian

contained these territorial provisions: "7. The following areas belong to the Croat tribe: Croatia and Slavonia with the Military Frontier; Istria with the islands, Carniola, Carinthia, and the Slavic portion of Styria; Bosnia from the dry frontier [that is, with Dalmatia] to the Vrbas and Dalmatia to the Cetina, that is, the districts of Split and Zadar, the old royal heartlands of the Croats. 8. The following areas belong to the Serb tribe: Serbia, Old Serbia with Sofia, the entire Slavic Macedonia, Zeta with the Mirdite area [of northern Albania], the districts of Kotor and Dubrovnik in Dalmatia with the adjacent islands, Montenegro, Hercegovina, Bosnia from the Vrbas to the Drina, and Srem [Srijem] with the Serbian Vojvodina. 9. All other areas belong to the Bulgarian tribe." Durković-Jakšić, *Srbijansko-crnogorska saradnja*, p. 88. It is obvious that Ban did not recognize the existence of the Slovenes. Durković-Jakšić dates this project "before the rebellion of 1848." Though I did not have an opportunity to examine this project among Ban's papers in the Serbian Academy of Sciences, the usage and similarity with the alleged Serb-Croat secret agreement for mutual cooperation of December 1860, also written by Ban, cast doubt on Durković-Jakšić's periodization. Moreover, Vojislav J. Vučković has proved conclusively that the 1860 agreement was Ban's forgery and that such a document was never adopted. Vučković, "Neuspela politička akcija," pp. 400–403. Even so, Ban's authorship does indicate his acquaintance with *De Administrando Imperio*, and it certainly figured among his post-1848 proofs in favor of Dubrovnik's Serbian status.

68. Stjepan R. Ban [Luko Zore?], *Hrvatski razgovori i odgovori* (Novi Sad, 1903), p. 7.

69. Quoted in Stojanović, *Politička propaganda*, pp. 20–21.

field, and then to prepare its entrance into pan-Slavdom."⁷⁰ Pucić, rather more influenced by Karadžić's linguistic teachings, thought it advisable to "correct" the ikavian subdialectal elements in his edition of Dživo Bunić Vučić's "Plاندovanja" ("Reposing Hours"), written in the mid-seventeenth century.⁷¹ But he also collaborated in Gaj's *Danica* and supported the adoption of Gaj's "Croatian orthography" in Dalmatia.⁷² And even Nikolajević resisted Serb pressures to boycott Gaj's publications.⁷³

The Illyrian movement wanted to create a single linguistic standard for all the South Slavs. Though the modified štokavian dialect was the principal means to this end, the Illyrianists also wanted to enrich it with elements of the čakavian and kajkavian dialects of Croatia. In doing so they were defending the totality of Croat literary tradition, to which the literature of Dubrovnik also belonged. As partakers in that tradition, despite their Serb national orientation, Ban and Pucić were closer to the Illyrianists than to Karadžić. They followed Karadžić in national ideology but not in linguistic practice, for, paradoxically, these linguistic Serbs were Croats by virtue of linguistic practice.

The "Serb-Catholics," however, diverged from Karadžić's national ideology in one important respect. Whereas Serbian cultural leaders, including Karadžić, rejected the "Illyrian" term, which Gaj envisioned as the banner of the spiritual unification of the South Slavs, the "Serb-Catholics" did not go quite that far. The Orthodox Serb intellectuals feared that the promotion of Illyrian consciousness would undermine Serb national identification, and they saw no reason why the term "Serb" could not itself serve for all South Slavs. Evstafij Mihajlović in his famous polemic *Illiri i Srbli* (Illyrians and the Serbs, 1834), for example, attempted to prove, with the aid of Šafařík, that all South Slavs were really Serbs. He concluded that the Croats "who are our born, full-blooded brothers, cannot [properly] call themselves Illyrians," and that therefore "our literature should be called Serbian . . . though [the South Slavs] shall not as a result lose [their] regional names."⁷⁴

The members of the "Serb-Catholic" circle certainly insisted on the proper usage of the Serb name for Dubrovnik but saw no reason why Illyrianist nomenclature could not act as a tactical substitute. In fact, both Ban and Pucić thought nothing of modifying their "programmatic" poems to fit the Illyrianist mold. Ban allowed his "Serb-Ragusan hymn" of 1848 to appear in *Zora dalmatinska*, the Croat journal in Zadar, with an entirely different opening line: "Ja sam stare Dubrave / plemeniti sin . . ." ("I am the noble son of ancient Dubrava").⁷⁵ Pucić's poem of 1841 from the "Bosnian Songs" cycle also exists in a different version among the author's manuscripts.

70. Matija Ban, "Osnova sveslavianskoga jezika," *Dubrovnik*, 1 (1849): 282.

71. Orsat Počić [Medo Pucić], "Plاندovanja Ivana Bunića Vučićevića vlastel. dubrov. s uvodniem govorom Orsata Počića," *ibid.*, p. 18.

72. Orsat Počić [Medo Pucić], "Dopisi iz Italije," *Danica horvatska, slavonska i dalmatinska*, 9 (1843), no. 33: 129–30.

73. See Djordje Nikolajević, "Osuditelj," *Danica horvatska, slavonska i dalmatinska*, no. 14: 54–55.

74. Evstafij Mihajlović, *Illiri i Srbli* (Novi Sad, 1843), pp. 60, 71.

75. Matija Ban, "Pisma Dubrovačka," *Zora dalmatinska* (Zadar), 5 (1848), no. 23: 91–92.

Its alternate opening is "Mladi Iliri bud'mo mi" ("Young Illyrians let us be").⁷⁶ Nikolažević's occasional use of neutral terminology has already been noted.⁷⁷

It is far more significant that the accommodation of "Serb-Catholics" to Illyrianist concepts also extended into the purely political field. Ban's and Pucić's contributions to the cause of Dalmatia's unification with northern Croatia were of no small importance and were in no way diminished by the fact that they could not have done less than the Serbian government, which supported this policy in 1848–1849. Nevertheless, their enthusiasm for the unification accomplished more than Garašanin's best efforts. Pucić's response to the developments in Croatia-Slavonia was evident from his attachment to Jelačić's cause.

The intricate nature of this alliance must be emphasized. Following the abandonment of absolutism and the promulgation of the October Diploma (October 20, 1860), Pucić resumed his campaign for the unification of Dalmatia with northern Croatia. His brother, Niko Veliki Pucić (1820–1883), who did not entirely share Medo's views, became a deputy to the Croatian Sabor in 1861. Yet Medo strictly differentiated among the real, titular, and political prerogatives of Croatia-Slavonia. He believed that Croatia, as the leader of the Habsburg South Slavs, had the political duty "to gather and crystallize the Austrian [that is, Habsburg] Slavs into one body."⁷⁸ (Serbia had the identical task among the South Slavs of the Ottoman Empire.) The area of Civil Croatia and Slavonia truly belonged to the Triune Kingdom of Croatia, Slavonia, and Dalmatia, and the Croatian-Slavonian Military Frontier and Dalmatia (from which Pucić excluded Dubrovnik and Kotor) were its titular domains. Pucić argued that Vienna should grant the Croat demands to unite these areas under the constitutional system vested in the Croatian Sabor, but he wanted it known that in his opinion Croatia had no "diplomatically proven right to Dubrovnik and Kotor apart from reference to Hungary."⁷⁹

This was a quaint interpretation of the Treaty of Zadar (1358), whereby Venice resigned its rights over Dalmatia (as it was then understood, from the Gulf of Kvarner to the Albanian Durrës) in favor of Louis the Great, king of Hungary and Croatia, thereby ending the Venetian overlordship in Dubrovnik. Yet Louis could claim the commune of Dubrovnik only as the king of Croatia and Dalmatia, to which Dubrovnik, as a former part of Byzantine Dalmatia, also belonged — this despite the fact that the Croatian kings had never before succeeded in imposing their authority in the area of Dubrovnik and Kotor. Pucić was therefore willing to contribute to the Slavic cause by strengthening the consolidation of the South Slavs in the Habsburg Monarchy (including the Serbs) around Croatia. Dubrovnik and Kotor were to participate in this arrangement, but Pucić did not wish to leave the impression that Croatia's historical or state right compelled such a process by any legitimist claim. Though a political conservative, he foresaw that the entire concept of historical right would soon be

76. Naučna biblioteka, Dubrovnik, Sastavci i prijepisi M. Pucića, Rkp. 58, p. 82.

77. Compare n. 19.

78. Medo Pucić, "Državopravna pogodba," *Domobran* (Zagreb), 1 (1864), no. 34: 1.

79. *Ibid.*, p. 2. Pucić was even more explicit in ridiculing Croat claims to Ottoman Bosnia-Herzegovina as the "virtual" territory of the Triune Kingdom and the lands that should be restored to Croatia upon the end of Ottoman rule. *Ibid.*

conveyed to a medieval dustbin, but he also feared that the inevitable victory of nationalism (of national right) might in part be diverted away from the only acceptable (that is, linguistic) lines in favor of the often arbitrary medieval frontiers.

Fighting against such an outcome, Pucić repeatedly reinterpreted Croatia's ancient historical right to fit his linguistic scheme, as when he decided to curtail this right at the frontier of "Serb" Dubrovnik and Kotor. In 1867 he did something rather different. He suggested that "if language is sufficient for the designation of a people," then Gaj's adoption of the "Serbian language for official use" really made all Croats linguistic Serbs. Therefore the Serbs had nothing to fear from Croat historical right, since it was, after all, really theirs: "*la causa del regno croato è sempre la causa serba.*"⁸⁰

Like a good many other nineteenth-century South Slav political thinkers, Pucić was caught within the charmed circle of assimilationist claims. As a Catholic from Dubrovnik, he saw no real difference between himself and the Croats, because no differences existed either in language or in cultural tradition. He was really a Croat Illyrianist with Serb national consciousness, and as long as Illyrianist ideas predominated he viewed them as primary. This attitude explains in part why Gaj and the other Illyrianists hardly bothered to challenge the "Serb-Catholic" ideas in Dubrovnik or all the claims about the Serb nature of štokavian dialect. They preferred to think that a common Illyrianist culture would make such wrongheaded theories obsolete.

Much the same can be said of one aspect of Matija Ban's activities. In his own words, Ban certainly "Slavicized his Serbianism" upon coming to Belgrade in 1844.⁸¹ He even promoted the creation of a single Slavic language, and his use of the term "tribe" for Serbs and Croats indicates that he viewed them as subnational groups within the larger Slavic nationality. After 1850, he spent the remainder of his long life almost entirely in Belgrade and on his nearby property at Banovo Brdo (Ban's Hill), which is today a part of the growing Serbian metropolis. He brooded over the growing Serb-Croat tensions, predicting that the new "tribal fanaticism" that led to the Serbo-Bulgarian war in 1885 could easily be repeated between Serbs and Croats "if only their hands were untied" by the powers.⁸² He yearned for the renewal of the "idea of South Slav oneness" and promoted it by writing plays with non-Serb themes, such as *Knez Nikola Zrinjski* ("Prince Nikola Zrinjski," 1888), based on the life of the Croat national hero of the siege of Szigetvár in 1566.

There was, however, another Ban — the propagandist who could not understand why the Croats objected to his promotion of Serbian national consciousness in Dubrovnik, the proselytizer whose journal *Dubrovnik* provoked Ante Starčević, the main force in shaping integral Croat national ideology, into his first show of resistance against the expansion of Serbian nationalism.⁸³ This aspect of Ban's activities includes attempts in 1860 to gain the support of the Russian Slavophiles for his proposed South Slav federation of

80. Orsatto Pozza [Medo Pucić], *La Serbia e l'Impero d'Oriente* (Florence, 1867), p. 26.

81. Matija Ban, "Osnova," p. 292.

82. Matija Ban, "Glasu Dubrovačkômu," *Glas Dubrovački* (Dubrovnik), 1 (1886), no. 14: 110.

83. Σ. [Ante Starčević], "Dubrovnik cviet narodnoga književstva," *Narodne novine* (Zagreb), 17 (1851), no. 230: 662.

Serb, Croat, and Bulgar autonomous territories. He assured Ivan Aksakov that the plan would be based on the equality of churches, though the Catholics would be invited to cross to Orthodoxy and the Croats would accept the Cyrillic script in stages.⁸⁴

The proposal is central to the appreciation of religion within the "Serb-Catholic" world view and to the problem of the confessional "rule." It is obvious that the national component of Catholicism is not an exact equivalent of the national-religious symbiosis of the Serbian Orthodox tradition. The difference is not simply that one church is "catholical" and the other "local": national traditions were certainly not absent in the Catholic culture of the Croat lands. But confessional affiliation is not merely a matter of adherence to certain doctrinal tenets. If dogma were the only subject at issue, the few points of disagreement between Rome and the Eastern churches would be far easier to reconcile. The East and West were, however, separated by two distinct historical experiences and, more important, by different mentalities that overflowed into those social and intellectual relations that are, loosely expressed, secular. The Croat and Serb mentalities were profoundly influenced by the spirit that emanated from the two churches. The ecclesiastical influence was not, of course, the only factor that shaped the two national mentalities, and it did not act upon the two peoples in the same way, but its existence had to be taken into account even by persons of avowed secular orientation, and it was certainly one of the main problems for the "Serb-Catholics."

Young Matija Ban's abandonment of a priestly vocation seems to have provoked all sorts of spiritual uncertainties. His belief in a Supreme Being is evident from numerous poetic references, but this sensibility did not imply worship. Nor did he believe that God "takes account of such trifles as . . . [human] earthly affairs," an opinion which, according to Ban, earned him Njegoš's benign admonishment in 1849: "Look, look, shouted the bishop [Njegoš], the Ragusans are known for their piety, and see what happened to you! You must have been corrupted in Belgrade."⁸⁵ Though some considered Ban an atheist,⁸⁶ he himself said, "I was born a Catholic, I live among the Orthodox, but I am really a deist."⁸⁷

It is not surprising that a man of Ban's religious indifference could manifest partiality to Orthodoxy. Or, to put it more precisely, there is nothing odd about Ban's conviction that Orthodox religious culture promoted the growth of Serb national consciousness. Ban could also defend the Catholic intolerance of the Republic of Dubrovnik as an unamiable but necessary example of *raison d'état*, because "if the unity of faith is in the interest of every state in all periods [of history], this is especially the case with small states."⁸⁸ Religion, or rather the national mentality promoted by a specific church, was thus a means to national unity. This is certainly a firmly expressed

84. S. A. Nikitin, *Slavianskie komitety v Rossii* (Moscow, 1960), pp. 150–51. The overture toward the Slavophiles came only five years after Ban's ode to Sultan Abdulmecit I, written at the height of the Crimean War.

85. Matija Ban, "Drugi susret sa vladikom Radom," *Politika* (Belgrade), 22 (1925), no. 6248: 2.

86. Đurković-Jakšić, *Branislav*, p. 25, n. 41.

87. AII:MB, p. 28, Letter to Ljudevit Gaj, Belgrade, February 17, 1848 (O.S.).

88. Matija Ban, "Zèrcalo poviestnice dubrovačke," *Dubrovnik*, 1 (1849): 145–46.

illustration of the spirit that distinguishes the nationalist attitude toward religion.

Though indifferent to religion, Ban was acutely aware that Orthodoxy alone could be put to use for his nationalist ends. In accordance with this perception (and in spite of his Catholic background), he urged Nikolajević to introduce the feast day of Saint Sava, the founder of the autocephalous Serbian church, as a holiday of great solemnity in the Ragusan Orthodox congregation⁸⁹ — obviously for the purpose of strengthening the national consciousness of Dubrovnik's Orthodox Serbs. And in a letter to Gaj of 1848, Ban welcomed papal attempts to further Church Slavonic liturgy and Eastern vestments among the Catholic Slavs of the Latin rite, part of Rome's continuing effort to attract the Orthodox Slavs. Though this letter is almost certainly one of the spurious ones, it is a good example of Ban's enthusiasm for the unity of churches based on the trappings that favored Eastern customs: "It is enough for the South Slavs that the same rituals, language, and vestments prevail in both churches, that is, that we achieve complete external unity. As far as dogma is concerned, let us not lose any sleep over it. Let each retain his own."⁹⁰

Although all Ban's preferred changes were for the benefit of the Croats, or, as it were, "Catholic-Serbs," he was convinced that papal initiatives were so much "common Roman trickery; the pope wants to bring our Orthodox brothers under his wide mantle. Let us make use of this illusion."⁹¹ Reasoning that the Orthodox were impervious to Catholic influence, Ban concluded that Serb unity therefore required the furtherance of Orthodoxy among the Catholics. Though Ban himself never bothered to become Orthodox, other "Catholic-Serbs," for instance Stjepan Verković, Ban's courier and a former Bosnian Franciscan, did take that step. After converting to Orthodoxy, Verković spent the 1850s in Macedonia working as a Serbian agent. In other words, under certain circumstances modern nationalism determined religious belief, in total contradiction to the scheme usually applied to the Serb-Croat terrain.

There were thus two patterns evident in the growth of Serb national consciousness among the štokavian-speaking South Slavs. In the Orthodox community the pattern was "Orthodox = Serb." Ivan Franjo Jukić (1818–1858), a Franciscan, one of Gaj's principal associates in Bosnia and the only Croat critic of Serb linguistic nationhood during the Illyrianist period, provided the history of this pattern:

Ever since the Illyrian [South Slavic] Serbs started tending their special literature [that is, the Serbian vernacular literature, as opposed to the old Church Slavonic] at the end of the last [eighteenth] century . . . they were obliged to refer to all the Illyrians [South Slavs] of Eastern confession as Serbs, whether or not they were the descendants of the Serbs, Croats, Old Illyrians, Cincars [Hellenized Vlachs], etc. This designation according to religion was accepted in the cities in such a way that, for example, the Illyrians of the Eastern church, who live in Croatia, and who previously called themselves Croats, now, that is, since the time they started occupying themselves with literature, call themselves Serbs. What is necessary now is that the common folk in Croatia, Dalmatia, Hercegovina, Bosnia,

89. AII:MB, p. 62, Letter to Djordje Nikolajević, Belgrade, December 14, 1850 (O.S.).

90. AII:MB, p. 28, Letter to Ljudevit Gaj, Belgrade, February 17, 1848 (O.S.).

91. AII:MB, p. 27, Letter to Ljudevit Gaj, Belgrade, February 17, 1848 (O.S.).

and Slavonia, who so far have not understood the benefit of such designation . . . become fond of and accept this name, offered to them in a *wider* confessional sense.⁹²

Though the pattern could not necessarily be applied in the same way to establish the identity of the concepts "Catholic" and "Croat," Jukić was essentially describing the venerable confessional "rule."

The second pattern represented the opposite. It assumed Serb nationality by virtue of štokavian dialect and then suggested Orthodoxy as the buttress of Serb feeling. Of course, not all "Serb-Catholics" — not even a significant number — became Orthodox. By the end of the nineteenth century there were even Catholic priests in Serb ranks. Yet the affinity for Orthodoxy certainly marked even the "Serb-Catholic" clergymen. It could not be otherwise. Just as the role of Jan Hus in modern Czech national ideology undermined the integrity of Catholicism in Bohemia, so the role of specifically Orthodox figures in the Serb national pantheon (for example, Saint Sava) could not but represent a latent problem for the Catholic church. This in turn provoked a Catholic clerical backlash, which usually stressed the "rule," that is, the identity of Croatianism and Catholicism.

Jukić also showed an awareness of the urban-social influences on the growth of Serb national consciousness outside Serbia proper. If his description of the situation among the Orthodox is accurate, the urban, middle and upper class character of the Ragusan and Dalmatian "Serb-Catholics" was all the more pronounced. A "Serb-Catholic" politician even stated that on the eve of the Great War out of some 600,000 Dalmatians 120,000 were Orthodox Serbs and approximately 20,000 to 25,000 were Catholic Serbs: "Serbs of Orthodox faith were in the majority of cases peasants, those of Catholic faith mainly intellectuals."⁹³ Moreover, it was a sign of learning and good taste to be a "Serb-Catholic" in Dubrovnik: "All the most learned and best people among us are Serbs. And only such people really count and not the miserable, ignorant, seduced, and insanely incited peasants," who in fact felt themselves Croats.⁹⁴ But in addition to the agnostic, rationalist, and anticlerical atmosphere which, in contrast to Catholic folk piety, prevailed in this environment, another sensibility, that of the aristocratic conservatives, represented by Medo Pucić, was also alive among many of Dubrovnik's "Serb-Catholic" intellectuals.

Though Pucić also had to contend with accusations of atheism,⁹⁵ he was a pious Christian, conscious of religious obligations even in his poetry.⁹⁶ His religious devotion was reserved especially for the image of dead Dubrovnik, whose once proud republican system he endowed with utopian qualities. Pucić was in many ways the originator of the Ragusan conservative utopia so evident in the works of Ivan Stojanović and in those of the Vojnović brothers, Ivo, the

92. S. D—ć, Pravoljub [pseud. Ivan Franjo Jukić], "Potomci hãrvatah i sèrbaljah u ilirskih dèržavah," *Danica ilirska*, 8 (1842), no. 29: 115.

93. Lujo Bakotić, *Srbi u Dalmaciji od pada Mletačke republike do Ujedinjenja* (Belgrade, 1939), p. 5.

94. S. R. Ban, *Hrvatski razgovori*, p. 55.

95. Dragutin Prohaska, "Adam Mickiewicz i Medo Pucić," *Nastavni vjesnik* (Zagreb), 24 (1916), no. 5: 356.

96. Pucić, "Plandovanja," p. 16.

leading dramatist, and Lujo, the leading historian of turn-of-the-century Dubrovnik.⁹⁷ An austere patrician, quite different in temperament from Ban and Nikolajević, Pucić was disdainful of the bourgeois values of Dubrovnik's Habsburg masters. His was the world of old paternalism in which religion played the role of spiritual intermediary. His social ideal and his idea of liberty were vested in the corporatist order of prerevolutionary Mediterranean republics.

Pucić particularly hated Austria as a tyrannical autocracy which perverted the old conservative values with the crassness of sovereign bourgeois wealth. Antun Gustav Matoš, the leading Croat modernist, believed that the "traditionalist, Latinist Ragusans, such as Pucić and the other Serbianized elements, turned out as they did . . . out of spite toward freedom-killing Austria." He thought that the fall of the Republic of Dubrovnik and the lack of freedom in Habsburg Croatia inclined this elite toward Serbianism, which "though neither cultured, aristocratic, nor Latin, nevertheless [was] free, and could therefore also free [the Ragusans]."⁹⁸ This essentially aesthetic disposition paved the way for the fashion of Serbian linguistic nationhood. Albert Haler convincingly brought out the contradictions between Pucić's total immersion in classical Western culture, his romantic attributes, and his political affinities. In his poetic description of the Russo-Montenegrin looting of Dubrovnik's territory during the Napoleonic wars, however, Pucić pointedly differentiated between *našinci* (our people, Ragusans) and the "bestly" depredators.⁹⁹ His conservative utopia and Illyrianist past were incompatible with Serb-Croat strife, and only his death in 1882 spared him the spectacle of bitter confrontations between the national leaders of the two peoples.

The confrontation between Serb and Croat national ideologies commenced in earnest after the Austro-Hungarian occupation of Bosnia-Hercegovina. The "Serb-Catholic" circle of Dubrovnik, now under the leadership of younger forces, became increasingly open in its anti-Croatianism, willing to break with the annexationist — and if not Illyrianist, then certainly anti-anti-Illyrianist — traditions of its founders. Its influence waxed and waned until the complete collapse during the interwar period, when the reality of Serbian supremacy and the political-cultural movement of Stjepan Radić combined to complete the diffusion of Croat national consciousness that had begun with the Revival. To the very end, however, the circle stuck to its linguistic guns, an example of how this aberrant variant of political Serbianism expressed the obfuscating — in Mannheim's sense ideological — side of modern nationalism. One suspects that the influence of the circle would have been more lasting had it ever gained a foothold among nonintellectuals. As it was, even at the turn of the century, the attainments of the circle were connected with the scholarly reputation of Vuk Karadžić:

— Mrki Vuče, čeljust još raspeči
Jeda skoro ne ostane niko,
Da se tvomu preporodu beči.

97. On this subject, see Ivo Banac, "Struktura konzervativne utopije braće Vojnovića," in Frano Čale, ed., *Radovi međunarodnog simpozija o djelu Iva Vojnovića* (Zagreb, 1981), pp. 19–49.

98. Antun Gustav Matoš, *Sabrana djela* (Zagreb, 1973), 14:88; 6:189.

99. Haler, *Novija dubrovačka književnost*, pp. 88–89.

— Stern Vuk, stretch your jaws wider,
So that soon no one will remain
To make faces at your revival.¹⁰⁰

100. Milivoj Strahinić [pseud. Luko Zore], *Objavljenje* (Rijeka, 1889), p. 145.